UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/054,563	01/22/2002	Michael E. Garrean	CAS 01-1-2	7233

23531 7590 08/03/2004

SUITER WEST PC LLO
14301 FNB PARKWAY
SUITE 220
OMAHA, NE 68154

EXAMINER	
BETIT, JACOB F	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2175	2

DATE MAILED: 08/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/054,563	GARREAN, MICHAEL E.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jacob F. Betit	2175	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-38* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-10,12-24,26-34 and 35-38* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *11,25 and* [redacted] is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The arrangement of the disclosed application does not conform with 37 CFR 1.77(b). Section headings are underlined throughout the disclosed specification. Section headings should not be underlined. Appropriate corrections are required according to the guidelines provided below:

2. The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

(a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
(b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
(c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
(d) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC (See 37 CFR 1.52(e)(5) and MPEP 608.05. Computer program listings (37 CFR 1.96(c)), "Sequence Listings" (37 CFR 1.821(c)), and tables having more than 50 pages of text are permitted to be submitted on compact discs.) or
REFERENCE TO A "MICROFICHE APPENDIX" (See MPEP § 608.05(a). "Microfiche Appendices" were accepted by the Office until March 1, 2001.)
(e) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
(1) Field of the Invention.
(2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
(f) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
(g) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
(h) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.

(i) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
(j) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
(k) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

Claim Objections

3. Claims 37 and 38 objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 37 recites the limitation "at least storage device" in line 3. This phrase makes the claim unclear. For the purpose of examining it is assumed that it was meant --at least one storage device--.

Claim 38 is objected to for being dependent on objected to independent claim 37.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. Claims 28-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 28 recites the limitation "means, if the address of the obtained record is determined to be in the set of known addresses" in lines 5-6. This limitation renders the claim indefinite

because it is not clear what will happen to the means if the address of the obtained record is not determined to be in the set of known addresses.

Claims 29-34 are rejected as being dependent on rejected independent claim 28.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-8, 14-22, 28-32, and 37-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Earl et al. (U.S. patent No. 6,041,324).

As to claim 1, Earl et al. teaches a method for identifying a record with valid address information, but invalid name information, comprising:

obtaining a record containing a name and an address (see column 11, lines 48-51);

determining if the address is in a set of known addresses (see column 11, line 60 through column 12, line 23); and

if the address of the obtained record is determined to be in the set of known addresses, determining if the name of the obtained record is in a subset of known names associated with the

address by calculating a weighted name value for the name and comparing the weighted name value with a predetermined threshold name value (This claim limitation is optionally recited accordingly it does not hold any patentable weight. This limitation may be recited so as to avoid reciting the step as an option such as "after determining the address is in a set of known address, determining that the name of the obtained record is in a subset of known names ...").

Claims 2-8 are rejected because they are entirely addressed to features which form a part of the optionally recited limitation of claim 1. Accordingly these features carry no patentable weight.

As to claim 14, Earl et al. teaches a method for identifying records with valid address information, but invalid name information. comprising:

obtaining a record containing a name and an address (see column 11, lines 48-51);

determining if the address is in a set of known addresses (see column 11, line 60 through column 12, line 23); and

if the address of the obtained record is determined to be in the set of known addresses, determining if the name of the obtained record is in a subset of known names associated with the address using a heuristic (This claim limitation is optionally recited accordingly it does not hold any patentable weight. This limitation may be recited so as to avoid reciting the step as an option such as "after determining the address is in a set of known address, determining that the name of the obtained record is in a subset of known names ...").

Claims 15-22 are rejected because they are entirely addressed to features which form a part of the optionally recited limitation of claim 14. Accordingly these features carry no patentable weight.

As to claim 28, Earl et al. teaches a system for identifying a record with valid address information, but invalid name information, comprising:

means for obtaining a record containing a name and an address (see column 11, lines 48-51);

means for determining if the address is in a set of known addresses (see column 11, line 60 through column 12, line 23); and

means, if the address of the obtained record is determined to be in the set of known addresses, for determining if the name of the obtained record is in a subset of known names associated with the address by calculating a weighted name value for the name and comparing the weighted name value with a predetermined threshold name value (This claim limitation is optionally recited accordingly it does not hold any patentable weight. This limitation may be recited so as to avoid reciting the step as an option such as "means, after determining the address is in a set of known address, for determining that the name of the obtained record is in a subset of known names ...").

Claims 29-32 are rejected because they are entirely addressed to features which form a part of the optionally recited limitation of claim 28. Accordingly these features carry no patentable weight.

As to claim 37, Earl et al. teaches an information handling system, comprising:

a computer (see column 1, lines 5-10); and

at least one storage device coupled to the computer, the at least one storage device being capable of storing records comprised of names and an addresses (see column 11, lines 48-67),

wherein the system is suitable for identifying if a record with valid address but an invalid name by determining if the address is in a set of known addresses (see column 11, line 60 through column 12, line 23) and, if the address of the record is determined to be in the set of known addresses, determining if the name of the record is in a subset of known names associated with the address by calculating a weighted name value for the name and comparing the weighted name value with a predetermined threshold name value (This claim limitation is optionally recited accordingly it does not hold any patentable weight. This limitation may be recited so as to avoid reciting the step as an option such as "after determining the address is in a set of known address, determining that the name of the obtained record is in a subset of known names ...").

Claim 38 is rejected because it is entirely addressed to features which form a part of the optionally recited limitation of claim 37. Accordingly these features carry no patentable weight.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 9-10, 12-13, 23-24, 26-27 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Earl et al. (U.S. patent No. 6,041,324) in view of Degen et al. (U.S. patent No. 6,418,436 B1).

As to claims 9, 23, and 33 Earl et al. does not teach wherein the step of determining if the address is in a set of known addresses comprises calculating a weighted address value for the address and comparing the weighted address value with a predetermined threshold address value.

Degen et al. teaches a system for purchasing card fraud detection (see abstract), in which he teaches wherein the step of determining if the address is in a set of known addresses comprises calculating a weighted address value for the address and comparing the weighted address value with a predetermined threshold address value (see column 6, lines 29-59).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Earl et al. to include wherein the step of determining if the address is in a set of known addresses comprises calculating a weighted address value for the address and comparing the weighted address value with a predetermined threshold address value.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Earl et al. by the teachings of Degen et al. because wherein the step of determining if the address is in a set of known addresses comprises calculating a weighted address value for the address and comparing the weighted address value with a

predetermined threshold address value would allow a match only if a predefined portion of the information was matching (see Degen et al., column 6, lines 4-19).

As to claims 10 and 24, Earl et al. as modified, teaches wherein weighted address value is calculated using the formula:

$$WAV = (W1 \cdot V1) + (W2 \cdot V2) + ...(Wn \cdot Vn)$$

where WAV is the weighted address value, W(1,...n) is the weight assigned to components of the address and V(1,. . .n) is a value assigned to components of the address (see Degen et al., column 6, lines 29-59).

As to claim 12 and 26, Earl et al. as modified, teaches wherein the obtained address is determined to be in the set of known addresses if the weighted address value for the address is less than a predetermined threshold address value (see Degen et al., column 6, lines 29-59).

Claims 13 and 27 are rejected because they are entirely addressed to features which form a part of the optionally recited limitations of claims 1 and 14. Accordingly these features carry no patentable weight.

9. Claims 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Earl et al. (U.S. patent No. 6,041,324) in view of Johnson et al. (U.S. patent No. 5,799,302).

As to claim 35, Earl et al. teaches a mail processing system, comprising:

a computer (see column 1, lines 5-10); and

wherein the system is suitable for identifying if a record with valid address but an invalid name by determining if the address is in a set of known addresses (see column 11, line 60 through column 12, line 23) and, if the address of the record is determined to be in the set of known addresses, determining if the name of the record is in a subset of known names associated with the address by calculating a weighted name value for the name and comparing the weighted name value with a predetermined threshold name value (This claim limitation is optionally recited accordingly it does not hold any patentable weight. This limitation may be recited so as to avoid reciting the step as an option such as "after determining the address is in a set of known address, determining that the name of the obtained record is in a subset of known names ...").

Earl et al. does not teach at least one printer coupled to the computer the at least one printer being capable of printing records comprised of names and an addresses to a mail media

Johnson et al. teaches a system for minimizing attribute naming errors in detecting duplicates in a database (see abstract), in which he teaches at least one printer coupled to the computer the at least one printer being capable of printing records comprised of names and an addresses to a mail media (see column 4, lines 16-30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Earl et al. to include at least one printer coupled to the computer the at least one printer being capable of printing records comprised of names and an addresses to a mail media

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Earl et al. by the teachings of Johnson et al. because at

least one printer coupled to the computer the at least one printer being capable of printing records comprised of names and an addresses to a mail media because at least one printer coupled to the computer the at least one printer being capable of printing records comprised of names and an addresses to a mail media would allow the reports to be printed (see Johnson et al., column 7, lines 54-67).

Claim 36 is rejected because they are entirely addressed to features which form a part of the optionally recited limitation of claim 35. Accordingly these features carry no patentable weight.

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-10, 12-24, 26-33, and 37-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Earl et al. (U.S. patent No. 6,041,324) in view of Degen et al. (U.S. patent No. 6,418,436 B1).

As to claim 1, Earl et al. teaches a method for identifying a record with valid address information, but invalid name information, comprising:

obtaining a record containing a name and an address (see column 11, lines 48-51);

determining if the address is in a set of known addresses (see column 11, line 60 through column 12, line 23); and

if the address of the obtained record is determined to be in the set of known addresses, determining if the name of the obtained record is in a subset of known names associated with the address (see column 12, line 17-23).

Earl et al. does not teach determining if the name of the obtained record is in a subset of known names associated with the address by calculating a weighted name value for the name and comparing the weighted name value with a predetermined threshold name value.

Degen et al. teaches determining if the name of the obtained record is in a subset of known names associated with the address by calculating a weighted name value for the name and comparing the weighted name value with a predetermined threshold name value (see column 6, lines 29-59).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Earl et al. to include determining if the name of the obtained record is in a subset of known names associated with the address by calculating a weighted name value for the name and comparing the weighted name value with a predetermined threshold name value.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Earl et al. by the teachings of Degen et al. because determining if the name of the obtained record is in a subset of known names associated with the address by calculating a weighted name value for the name and comparing the weighted name

value with a predetermined threshold name value would allow a match only if a predefined portion of the information was matching (see Degen et al., column 6, lines 4-19).

As to claims 2 and 29, Earl et al. as modified, teaches further comprising if the address is determined to be in the set of known addresses and the name is determined to not be in the subset of known names associated with the address, marking the record as having valid address information, but invalid name information (see Earl et al., column 12, lines 17-23).

As to claims 3 and 30, Earl et al. as modified, teaches further comprising preventing information from being mailed to the address of the marked record (see Earl et al., column 12, lines 17-23).

As to claims 4 and 31, Earl et al. as modified, teaches further comprising removing the marked record from a database of records (see Earl et al., column 12, lines 17-23, where it would be obvious to one skilled in the art to remove the record after it is reported invalid).

As to claims 5 and 19, Earl et al. as modified, teaches wherein weighted name value is calculated using the formula:

$$WNV = (W1 \cdot V1) + (W2 \cdot V2) + ...(Wn \cdot Vn)$$

where WNV is the weighted name value, W(1,.. .n) is the weight assigned to components of the name and V(1,...n) is a value assigned to components of the name (see Degen et al., column 6, lines 29-59).

As to claims 6 and 20, Earl et al. as modified, teaches wherein V(1,...n) is assigned a value of if the component matches a corresponding component of a name in the subset of known names and 0 if the component does not match the corresponding component of the name in the subset of known names (see Degen et al., column 6, lines 29-59).

As to claims 7 and 21, Earl et al. as modified, teaches wherein the name is determined to not be in the subset of known names associated with the known address if the weighted name value is less than the threshold name value (see Degen et al., column 6, lines 29-59).

As to claims 8 and 22, Earl et al. as modified, teaches further comprising, if the address is determined to be in the set of known addresses and the name is determined to not be in the subset of known names associated with the known address, marking the record as having valid address information, but invalid name information (see Earl et al., column 12, lines 17-33).

As to claims 9, 23, and 33, Earl et al. as modified, does not teach wherein the step of determining if the address is in a set of known addresses comprises calculating a weighted address value for the address and comparing the weighted address value with a predetermined threshold address value.

Degen et al. teaches wherein the step of determining if the address is in a set of known addresses comprises calculating a weighted address value for the address and comparing the

weighted address value with a predetermined threshold address value (see column 6, lines 29-59).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Earl et al. to include wherein the step of determining if the address is in a set of known addresses comprises calculating a weighted address value for the address and comparing the weighted address value with a predetermined threshold address value.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Earl et al. by the teachings of Degen et al. because wherein the step of determining if the address is in a set of known addresses comprises calculating a weighted address value for the address and comparing the weighted address value with a predetermined threshold address value would allow a match only if a predefined portion of the information was matching (see Degen et al., column 6, lines 4-19).

As to claims 10 and 24, Earl et al. as modified, teaches wherein weighted address value is calculated using the formula:

$$WAV = (W1 \cdot V1) + (W2 \cdot V2) + \ldots (Wn \cdot Vn)$$

where WAV is the weighted address value, W(1,...n) is the weight assigned to components of the address and V(1,. . .n) is a value assigned to components of the address (see Degen et al., column 6, lines 29-59).

As to claims 12 and 26, Earl et al. as modified, teaches wherein the obtained address is determined to be in the set of known addresses if the weighted address value for the address is less than a predetermined threshold address value (see Degen et al., column 6, lines 29-59)

As to claim 13, Earl et al. as modified, teaches further comprising, if the address is determined to be in the set of known addresses and the name is determined to not be in the subset of known names associated with the known address, marking the record as having valid address information, but invalid name information (see Earl et al., column 12, lines 17-33).

As to claim 14, Earl et al. teaches a method for identifying records with valid address information, but invalid name information. comprising:

obtaining a record containing a name and an address (see column 11, lines 48-51);

determining if the address is in a set of known addresses (see column 11, line 60 through column 12, line 23); and

if the address of the obtained record is determined to be in the set of known addresses, determining if the name of the obtained record is in a subset of known names associated with the address using a heuristic (see column 12, line 17-23).

Earl et al. does not teach determining if the name of the obtained record is in a subset of known names associated with the address using a heuristic.

Degen et al. teaches determining if the name of the obtained record is in a subset of known names associated with the address using a heuristic (see column 6, lines 29-59).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Earl et al. to include determining if the name of the obtained record is in a subset of known names associated with the address using a heuristic.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Earl et al. by the teachings of Degen et al. because determining if the name of the obtained record is in a subset of known names associated with the address using a heuristic would allow a match only if a predefined portion of the information was matching (see Degen et al., column 6, lines 4-19).

As to claim 15, Earl et al. as modified, teaches wherein the heuristic comprises calculating a weighted name value for the name and comparing the weighted name value with a predetermined threshold name value (see Degen et al., column 6, lines 29-59).

As to claim 16, Earl et al. as modified, teaches further comprising if the address is determined to be in the set of known addresses and the name is determined to not be in the subset of known names associated with the address, marking the record as having valid address information, but invalid name information (see Earl et al., column 12, lines 17-33).

As to claim 17, Earl et al. as modified, teaches further comprising preventing information from being mailed to the address of the marked record further comprising preventing information from being mailed to the address of the marked record (see Earl et al., column 12, lines 17-23, where it would be obvious to one skilled in the art to not mail to an invalid address name pair).

As to claim 18, Earl et al. as modified, teaches further comprising removing the marked record from a database of records (see Earl et al., column 12, lines 17-23, where it would be obvious to one skilled in the art to remove the record after it is reported invalid).

As to claim 27, Earl et al. as modified, teaches further comprising, if the address is determined to be in the set of known addresses and the name is determined to not be in the subset of known names associated with the known address, marking the record as having valid address information, but invalid name information (see Earl et al., column 12, lines 17-33).

As to claim 28, Earl et al. teaches a system for identifying a record with valid address information, but invalid name information, comprising:

means for obtaining a record containing a name and an address (see column 11, lines 48-51);

means for determining if the address is in a set of known addresses (see column 11, line 60 through column 12, line 23); and

means, if the address of the obtained record is determined to be in the set of known addresses, for determining if the name of the obtained record is in a subset of known names associated with the address (see column 12, line 17-23).

Earl et al. does not teach determining if the name of the obtained record is in a subset of known names associated with the address by calculating a weighted name value for the name and comparing the weighted name value with a predetermined threshold name value.

Degen et al. teaches determining if the name of the obtained record is in a subset of known names associated with the address by calculating a weighted name value for the name and comparing the weighted name value with a predetermined threshold name value (see column 6, lines 29-59).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Earl et al. to include determining if the name of the obtained record is in a subset of known names associated with the address by calculating a weighted name value for the name and comparing the weighted name value with a predetermined threshold name value.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Earl et al. by the teachings of Degen et al. because determining if the name of the obtained record is in a subset of known names associated with the address by calculating a weighted name value for the name and comparing the weighted name value with a predetermined threshold name value would allow a match only if a predefined portion of the information was matching (see Degen et al., column 6, lines 4-19).

As to claim 32, Earl et al. as modified, teaches wherein weighted name value is calculated using the formula:

$$WAV = (W1 \cdot V1) + (W2 \cdot V2) + ...(Wn \cdot Vn)$$

where WNV is the weighted name value, W(1,...n) is the weight assigned to components of the name and V(1,.. .n) is a value assigned to components of the name, wherein v(1,...n) is assigned a value of 1 if the component matches a corresponding component of a name in the

subset of known names and 0 if the component does not match the corresponding component of the name in the subset of known names (see Degen et al., column 6, lines 29-59).

As to claim 37, Earl et al. teaches an information handling system, comprising:

a computer (see column 1, lines 5-10); and

at least storage device coupled to the computer, the at least one storage device being capable of storing records comprised of names and an addresses (see column 11, lines 48-67),

wherein the system is suitable for identifying if a record with valid address but an invalid name by determining if the address is in a set of known addresses and, if the address of the record is determined to be in the set of known addresses, determining if the name of the record is in a subset of known names associated with the address (see column 12, lines 17-23).

Earl et al. does not teach determining if the name of the record is in a subset of known names associated with the address by calculating a weighted name value for the name and comparing the weighted name value with a predetermined threshold name value.

Degen et al. teaches determining if the name of the record is in a subset of known names associated with the address by calculating a weighted name value for the name and comparing the weighted name value with a predetermined threshold name value (see column 6, lines 29-59).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Earl et al. to include determining if the name of the record is in a subset of known names associated with the address by calculating a weighted name value for the name and comparing the weighted name value with a predetermined threshold name value.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Earl et al. by the teachings of Degen et al. because determining if the name of the record is in a subset of known names associated with the address by calculating a weighted name value for the name and comparing the weighted name value with a predetermined threshold name value would allow a match only if a predefined portion of the information was matching (see Degen et al., column 6, lines 4-19).

As to claim 38, Earl et al. as modified, teaches wherein the record is marked as having valid address information, but invalid name information if the address is determined to be in the set of known addresses and the name is determined to not be in the subset of known names associated the address (see Earl et al., column 12, lines 17-23).

11. Claims 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Earl et al. (U.S. patent No. 6,041,324) in view of Johnson et al. (U.S. patent No. 5,799,302) and in further view of Degen et al. (U.S. patent No. 6,418,436 B1).

As to claim 35, Earl et al. teaches a mail processing system, comprising:

a computer (see column 1, lines 5-10); and

wherein the system is suitable for identifying if a record with valid address but an invalid name by determining if the address is in a set of known addresses (see column 11, line 60 through column 12, line 23) and, if the address of the record is determined to be in the set of

known addresses, determining if the name of the record is in a subset of known names associated with the address (see column 12, lines 17-23).

Earl et al. does not teach at least one printer coupled to the computer the at least one printer being capable of printing records comprised of names and an addresses to a mail media

Johnson et al. teaches at least one printer coupled to the computer the at least one printer being capable of printing records comprised of names and an addresses to a mail media (see column 4, lines 16-30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Earl et al. to include at least one printer coupled to the computer the at least one printer being capable of printing records comprised of names and an addresses to a mail media

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Earl et al. by the teachings of Johnson et al. because at least one printer coupled to the computer the at least one printer being capable of printing records comprised of names and an addresses to a mail media because at least one printer coupled to the computer the at least one printer being capable of printing records comprised of names and an addresses to a mail media would allow the reports to be printed (see Johnson et al., column 7, lines 54-67).

Earl et al. as modified, still does not teach determining if the name of the record is in a subset of known names associated with the address by calculating a weighted name value for the name and comparing the weighted name value with a predetermined threshold name value.

Degen et al. teaches determining if the name of the record is in a subset of known names associated with the address by calculating a weighted name value for the name and comparing the weighted name value with a predetermined threshold name value (see column 6, lines 29-59).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Earl et al. as modified, to include determining if the name of the record is in a subset of known names associated with the address by calculating a weighted name value for the name and comparing the weighted name value with a predetermined threshold name value.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Earl et al. as modified, by the teachings of Degen et al. because determining if the name of the record is in a subset of known names associated with the address by calculating a weighted name value for the name and comparing the weighted name value with a predetermined threshold name value would allow a match only if a predefined portion of the information was matching (see Degen et al., column 6, lines 4-19).

As to claim 36, Earl et al. as modified, teaches wherein the record is marked as having valid address information, but invalid name information if the address is determined to be in the set of known addresses and the name is determined to not be in the subset of known names associated with the address to prevent printing of the record (see Earl et al., column 12, lines 17-23).

Allowable Subject Matter

12. Claims 11 and 25 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

13. Claim 34 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

14. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The prior art of record, Earl et al. (U.S. patent No. 6,041,324), Johnson et al. (U.S. patent No. 5,799,302), and Degen et al. (U.S. patent No. 6,418,436 B1), do not disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed limitations of (in combination with all other features in the claim):

wherein V(1,.. .n) is assigned a value of 1 if the component matches a corresponding component of an address in the set of known addresses, 0 if the component is not found in the set of known addresses and -1 if the component does not match the corresponding component of the address in the set of known addresses, as claimed in claim 11.

The prior art of record, Earl et al. (U.S. patent No. 6,041,324), Johnson et al. (U.S. patent No. 5,799,302), and Degen et al. (U.S. patent No. 6,418,436 B1), do not disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed limitations of (in combination with all other features in the claim):

wherein V(1,.. .n) is assigned a value of 1 if the component matches a corresponding component of an address in the set of known addresses, 0 if the component is not found in the set of known addresses and -1 if the component does not match the corresponding component of the address in the set of known addresses, as claimed in claim 25.

The prior art of record, Earl et al. (U.S. patent No. 6,041,324), Johnson et al. (U.S. patent No. 5,799,302), and Degen et al. (U.S. patent No. 6,418,436 B1), do not disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed limitations of (in combination with all other features in the claim):

wherein V(1,.. .n) is assigned a value of 1 if the component matches a corresponding component of an address in the set of known addresses, 0 if the component is not found in the set of known addresses and -1 if the component does not match the corresponding component of the address in the set of known addresses, as claimed in claim 34.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacob F. Betit whose telephone number is (703) 305-3735. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9 am to 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on (703) 305-3830. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

jfb
22 Jul 2004

SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER